
Page 1 of 2

United States District Court Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

April 25, 2025 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION



Pending before the Court are Plaintiff Chanel E. M. Nicholson's ("Nicholson" or "Plaintiff") Motion to Excuse Typographical Errors (Doc. No. 85), Motion for Hearing Regarding Timeliness of Claim and Employment Status (Doc. No. 86), Motion for Privacy and Protective Order (Doc. No. 87), Motion for Relief from Judgment under Rule 60(b) and Request to Revisit Other Claims (Doc. No. 88), Motion for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis (Doc. No. 89), and Motion to Pursue Justice and Protect the Integrity of Plaintiff's Claims (Doc. No. 90). Having considered the Plaintiff's motions and the applicable law, the Court hereby DENIES each motion.

After granting summary judgment in favor of the defendants, this Court entered final judgment dismissing this case with prejudice. (Doc. No. 70). Plaintiff appealed, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed. (Doc. No. 81). Plaintiff then filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States. As of today, the writ is still under consideration by the Supreme Court.

"[A] perfected appeal divests the district court of jurisdiction." *Shepherd v. Int'l Paper Co.*, 372 F.3d 326, 329 (5th Cir. 2004) (citing *Winchester v. United States Atty. for S.D. of Tex.*, 68 F.3d 947, 950 (5th Cir. 1995)). As such, this Court cannot consider Plaintiff's motions. Moreover, many

of the motions seek relief in a case not before this Court (4:23-cv-1025). The Court does not have jurisdiction to consider those issues or grant the relief requested. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the pending motions (Doc. Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 90) are **DENIED** due to lack of jurisdiction.

Signed on this 25 day of April, 2025.

Andrew S. Hanen

United States District Judge